

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,184	05/24/2001	John F. Breedis	102134-100	2996
27267 7590 08/18/2004			EXAMINER	
WIGGIN AND DANA LLP			IP, SIKYIN	
	PATENT DOCKETIN RY TOWER, P.O. BOX	_	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW HAVEN	, CT 06508-1832		1742	
			DATE MAILED: 08/18/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	t
Advisory Action	09/865,184	BREEDIS ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sikyin Ip	1742	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	tion. A proper reply to a	l
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth the dater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI fextension and the corresponding amount he shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate exteurnt of the fee. The appropriate exteurnt of the fee. The appropriate exteurnt of the fee.	nsion ension n: or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) I they raise new issues that would require furthe	r consideration and/or search (s	ee NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mater	ially reducing or simplifying	the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE: The newly recited limitations have never a	appeared in claims; thus, they raise	new issues.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would to canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendme	ent
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ requesting requesting the application in condition for allowance be a specific for exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ecause: See Continuation Sheet.		lace
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-11</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appro	oved or b) disapproved by th	e Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen			
	((a)(· · · · · ·	
		SIKYIN IP PRIMARY EXAMINER	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of reasons set forth in final rejection. Applicants argue that the examples in instant specification have shown the claimed stress relief annealing conditions are critical. But, they fail to compare examples in the specification to the closest art. Moreover,the invention defined in a product-by-process claim is a product, not a process.